

A
Second Address
TO THE
ANABAPTISTS:
BEING

A VINDICATION of the
Former from the Exceptions
made to it in a late Paper,

ENTITLED

A Brief Reply, &c.

By *Rich. George*, and *Tho. Ranger*.

By the Author of the Serious Address, &c.

*Wait for me a little, and I will show thee, that I
have yet to speak on God's behalf, Job. 36. 2.*

LONDON, Printed by W. B. for Richard
Widdowes at the King's Head in St. Paul's Church-
Lane. 1702.

Price 2 s.

Second Address

TO THE

ANABAPTISTS

AND INDICATION of the
former from the Exceptions
made to it in a late Paper.



By R. A. G. and J. A. R.

At the ... of ...

I have no objection to ...

... in ...

...

A
I
sent
Thor
char
so fr
this
Mini
thor
know
willi
it, a
to it
conf
to th

A Second

ADDRESS TO THE Anabaptists.

My dearly beloved Neighbours,

I Have received a Paper, Entituled, *A brief Reply to the serious Address*, which, for your sakes, I sometime since published. It is, I hear, a pretty while since it has been first dispersed among you, but I never saw it till the 25th of this present Month: Otherwise I should have given you my Thoughts of it sooner. And, I hope, I should have by that means prevented the Boasts which are now, I hear, so frequently made in those Parts where the Writers of this Reply live, viz. That it has convinced a Church-Minister of his Errour; meaning, I presume, the Author of the Address. But this I dare say, you who know me, never gave any credit to. For that however willing I am to embrace the Truth where-ever I find it, and don't care which way the Road lyes that leads to it, provided I may but come at it; yet, I must confess, I never yet could find any manner of reason to think you in the right, and those whom you oppose

54)

in the wrong. I can say, that according to the capacity which God has given me, I have carefully considered the places of Scripture produc'd both by You and the Assertors of Infant-Baptism; I have sincerely and without prejudice, read all the Books of your Writers which I could meet with, as Mr. *Tombs*, *Danvers*, *Keach*, *Collins*, *Blackwood*, &c. and after all, I cannot but think, that both They and You causelessly quarrel with the Church of Christ for this Practice of Hers, and very unjustly condemn it as sinful and unlawful: And this, I hoped, I had satisfied you of the truth of, in my late Letter by way of *Address* to you. But since by this Paper, which I presume contains your sense, I perceive I have not; but that you have still no cause to doubt, but that you are in the right, I shall not refuse farther to contribute my poor Endeavours, to convince you of what I think a mistake, and that too of no small consequence: And this, I hope, you'll take in good part, since I can with the utmost sincerity promise you, that I've no other End to carry on by so doing, besides the Honour of God and the Good of your own Souls.

But, before I go to a particular Answering this Paper, I think it necessary to remove one Prejudice which the Writers of it have lain in your way, and that is, their intimating that the Practice of Infant-Baptism is supported by the Authority of *Great Men*, and had its first rise from the *Pope*. This I the rather take notice of, because I've observ'd it to be the general Practice of your Writers, thus to endeavour to prejudice you against this Practice of the Christian Church. But to this I Answer, That there is no manner of Foundation for any such Insinuations as these. The Assertors of Infant-Baptism do all disclaim any other Authority than that of the Holy Scriptures. Thus Mr. *Calvin*: I by no means, says he, ask, That in the proof of Infant Baptism, we should be any ways assisted by Antiquity, any farther than it shall be found to have its Foundation in the Word of God: So Bishop *Taylor* observes, That the Church of God in baptizing Infants, did always do it on Scripture Grounds. And accordingly,

you

you may have observed, That the Writers for Infants Baptism, do always appeal to the Scriptures for the proof of this their Practice; which they would never do, did they design to support it by either their own or others Authority. And therefore, the Replyers, p. 8. abuse both You and Us, in telling you, That *our Will* and *we Will* brought in Infants Sprinkling without *God's Will*.

Indeed we have shewn, that the Practice of Infant Baptism has all along been universally used by the Church. But this we have not done, as if we thought the *lawfulness* of this Practice depended on *their* using it; but, for that Custom has been always esteemed the best Interpreter of a doubtful Law; and therefore, since these of your Opinion have doubted the meaning of our Saviour concerning the Subjects of Baptism, we thought it a proper way to convince you that *we* rightly understood our Lord's meaning, to shew you, That the Christian Church has always understood it as *we* do. Now this we have done, by shewing you, That the most early of the Christian Writers who mention Infant Baptism, speak of it as a Practice then commonly known. Nor can either You or We, after all the search that has been made, point out the time when this Practice began.

Your Writers indeed say, That Pope *Innocent* was the first introducer of it: But this appears to be a Mistake, since we find it practised before that Pope's time. By the Third Council of *Carthage*, 'tis decreed, That *nothing should be exacted of those who brought their Infants to be Baptized*: Which words plainly intimate, That Baptizing of Infants was the ordinary Practice at that time. Accordingly, *Tertullian*, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, who all lived before this Pope *Innocent*, do all speak of it as what was usually done. So *Irenaeus*, who was cotemporary with *Polycarp* a Disciple of the Apostles, and who writ this Book which we have of his, within *Fourscore* Years after the Death of *Sr. John*, makes mention of it, by saying, That *ALL Infants* as well as *Men*, in order to be saved by Christ, are to be Regenerated, that is, in the Language of these Times, *Baptized*.

And now, I pray consider, whether your Writers do not impose on you, by telling you, That from the beginning Infants were not baptized, but that it is an Innovation of the Church of Rome; and that, in order to be wholly reformed from Her, you must leave off the Practice of Infants Baptism, which is only one of Her Corruptions. Whereas indeed, as Mr. Calvin expresses it, *the Universal Church practised it before she understood what the Reign of the Pope meant, or that any thing was heard of it.* Besides, Can you entertain so mean an Opinion of all who lived at the beginning of Christianity, as to think, that notwithstanding their suffering so much for their refusing to do any thing contrary to the Instructions left them by Christ and his Apostles, they should yet permit such an Innovation to be brought in among them, and be received, which according to you, is such a Corruption of Christ's Ordinances?

We must think them to be indeed, ** Reply, p. 8.* what your Replyers term them, ** Children*, if we can thus think of them. Let not therefore this prejudice you against Infants Baptism, that 'tis only supported by the Authority of Great or Learned Men, and is the Invention of the Popes; but rather consider with your selves, whether since, as has been shewn you, the most early of the Writers of the Church mention this Practice, as what was commonly known and used, it be not reasonable to think that it owes its Original to Christ and his Apostles themselves.

Having thus, I hope, contributed somewhat to the removal of this Prejudice, I shall now endeavour more particularly to answer the Paper it self: And this I shall do by

First, Explaining some Passages in the Address, which the Replyers seem to have mistaken. And,

Secondly, Vindicating the Arguments I used, from the Exceptions made to them by them.

First then, I shall explain some Passages, &c. As, 1. The Replyers represent me, as saying, That Faith and Spiritual Regeneration are always necessary in order to Church-Membership: Which are words I never, tho' they are pleased to insist on them through-

through
Cause
in the
Regene
carna
And
not a
sion w
was to
ing b
it was
red o
prove
spel C
of Per
admit
2.
fants
But,
only
by vi
a righ
they a
claim
to be
who
Bapti
from
their
Instru
the M
So tha
which
of Chr
Force
the A
since
as be
now t
into C
use.

throughout this Paper, as if I had by them given up the Cause to them. What I said, was, That the Church in the Old Testament time, was constituted by Spiritual Regeneration; by which, I meant, that it was not a carnal Dispensation, or relating only to this Life: And so I explain'd my self, by saying, That he was not a *Jew* who was one outwardly, and that Circumcision was that of the Heart. And my Design by all this, was to shew, That *Infants*, notwithstanding all this, being by Circumcision entred into that Church; hence it was manifest, that *Faith* and *Repentance* being required of grown Persons under the Gospel, did no ways prove, That *Infants* were not to be a part of the Gospel Church, since the very *same* things were required of Persons in the *Jewish* Church, and yet *Infants* were admitted Members of it.

2. The Replyers represent me as saying, That *Infants* are in the Covenant of Grace without Baptism: But, by my saying that *Infants* are in the Covenant, I only meant, That the *Infants* or Seed of Believers have, by virtue of the Promise made by God to their Parents, a right to be admitted into Covenant with him; but that they are not actually in possession, or their right is not claimed, till they are baptized. Hence are *Infants* said to be baptized for the Remission of Sins; for, that they who were before under a Covenant of Works, are by Baptism brought into a Covenant of Grace, and so freed from whatever Guilt might be imputed to them by their First Parents Breach of it. By Baptism, as by an Instrument, is there a particular Application made of the Merits of Christ's Death to them who receive it. So that the former Covenant, or Covenant of Works, which was at first cancell'd by being *nail'd to the Cross of Christ*, is now particularly cancell'd, and put out of any Force, with respect to *those* that are baptized. Hence the Apostle calls *Baptism*, the *Washing of Regeneration*, since by it we are put into a new state; so that whereas before we were only the Children of *Adam*, we are now taken to be the Children of God, are implanted into Christ, and are sanctified and set apart to God's use. Hence are Believers, and their Seed, stiled *Holy*,

as being separated and chosen out of the World, and devoted to the Service of God.

3. The Replyers represent me, as saying, That Infants ought to receive Baptism as a Sign of their Faith and Repentance : Whereas on the contrary, I plainly enough said, That Infants do not *actually* believe, and repent ; and therefore, I might have hop'd to have been understood, as meaning, That Baptism is not administered to Infants as a sign of their, *at that present time*, believing ; not but that it is a sign of their being obliged, when capable, to believe and repent, or else to forfeit the Privileges of their Baptism. And therefore, they need not have told me, That *I do well to grant, that Infants cannot believe and repent, for that some have refused to do so* ; since, I never met with any that did affirm, that Infants could *actually* believe and repent ; and I believe, they would find it difficult to produce any one that has said so. Tho' indeed, this we do say, That Infants may be as well term'd *Believers* as rational Creatures ; because, tho' they cannot *actually* Believe, nor exercise their Reason, yet they have the power of Reasoning and Believing, which in time, they may become capable of exerting or putting into act. And therefore, 'tis both unreasonably, as well as rudely and impiously done, by some of your Writers, to compare † the Baptism of Infants to the Baptism of Bells and Fruit-trees ; and to say, we may as well pray, That God would || *illuminate a Stone or a Tree, as that he would regenerate one Infant.*

† *Pay's Rec.*
Cor. p. 12.
|| *Keach, Rec.*
Rec. p. 83.

4. The Replyers understand me, as saying, That the words, *Matth. xxviii. 19.* were only relating to *them that were then in being* : Whereas, I said, they chiefly or principally respected the Unbelieving *Jews and Gentiles*, i. e. *they* were most properly concern'd in them ; they being spoken chiefly on their account, since these words seem to be only an Enlargement of a former Commission given to the Apostles, by which they were only to make Disciples of the *Jewish Nation*, whereas now they were to disciple *all Nations*. But, I intend-

ed

ed not
ligatio
deny,
of the
Last
duced
to the
baptiz
of Ba
Baptis
which
a good
stood
admit
ing at
fore
minist
as ha
noran
they
given
tism
us by
have
actual
fore,
canno
answe
of the
oblig
and o
Th
Word
there
ments
As,
I.
cunc
Sign
I und
Cover

ed not to say any thing of the continuance of the Obligation laid on the Apostles by this Commission, or to deny, that it holds good to their Successors to the end of the World.

Lastly, The Replyers mistake me as to what I produced the Example of our Saviour for : Which was to shew, That 'twas not necessary that *all* who are baptized, should be capable of answering *all* the Ends of Baptism. Thus our Saviour was baptized; tho' Baptism could not be to him a Sign of Repentance, which yet is one End of Baptism. And this I thought a good Argument against your Opinion, which I understood to be, that all the Ends of Baptism they who are admitted to it, ought to be capable of actually answering at the time when they are baptized. What therefore the Replyers say of *John's* being ignorant of administering Baptism for the Forgiveness of Sins, to such as had no sin, is no ways material, since *we* are as ignorant of that as he. None of us ever pleaded, that they who had no sin, should be baptized for the forgiveness of it. But, as there are other Ends of Baptism besides this, therefore, as our Saviour has shewn us by his own Example, Persons may be baptized who have no Sins to be forgiven, and consequently do not actually answer *all* the Ends of Baptism. And therefore, to apply this to the Case before us; tho' Infants cannot actually believe, nor repent, yet since they can answer other Ends of Baptism, as having the benefits of the Covenant of Grace consign'd to them, and being oblig'd to do what *that* requires of them, they may and ought to be baptized.

These are all the Mistakes of the meaning of my Words which I have taken notice of. I proceed therefore in the next place, to vindicate the Arguments I used against the Exceptions made to them, As,

1. The Replyers except to my Argument from Circumcision, by denying, that Circumcision was the Sign of the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*. As I understand them, they own, That *Abraham* had a Covenant of Grace made with him, *Gen. xii.* and

Chap. xv.

Chap. xv. but that the Covenant mention'd, Chap. xvii. which Circumcision was appointed to be the Sign of, was a Covenant distinct from that made before, and of another kind : What then I am to prove is, That the Sign of Circumcision was the Seal or Token of the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham, and which the Apostle says, *was confirm'd of God in Christ*. Now, whoever reads Gen. xii, xiii, xv, xvii, and compares what is said in those several places, concerning the Covenant God made with Abraham, will, I believe, find no reason to doubt, but that in those several places there is only a repetition of the same Contract or Covenant; for that it is express'd in almost the same words. The same Promises are made by God, and the same Conditions required of Abraham; so that if that be a Covenant of Grace, which is mentioned Chap. xii. and xv. as the Replyers say it is, that must be so too which is mentioned Chap. xvii. and which Circumcision is expressly called a Token of; which indeed the Replyers themselves seem sensible of : And therefore in transcribing it, they have left out ver. 7. and the last part of ver. 8. where God promises Abraham to be a God to him and his Seed, that so it might look more like what they would have it to be, a Temporal and Earthly Covenant. But, they ought to have consider'd that even in Chap. xii. and xv. the Promise of the Land of Canaan is added to the other Promises as well as here. And indeed, if they were not prejudic'd, they could not but see, that there are Promises in Chap. xvii. of altogether as spiritual a Nature as what are made Chap. xii. and xv. and indeed of the same import or signification. Thus God promises here, That he will be a God to Abraham, and his Seed, and that he shall be a Father of many Nations. And wherein, I pray, does this differ from what is said before, That in him all the Families of the Earth should be blessed? For so they must be, if according to what is here said; Abraham be a Father of many Nations, and God be a God to them. But farther; That the Covenant mentioned Gen. xvii. is the same with that made before, is evident from the Apostles calling Circumcision

umci
Faith
all thi
that
Sign
was p
Circu
nant
Circu
ceptio
umcis
be so
as he
matter
and I
viz. t
disting
are w
cumci
2.
steemo
rents
be bap
commi
Guilt
not ch
* one
made
are Ch
to the
+ we
and th
not pla
pressio
Parent
sterity
Hence
all sha
the wa
tells us

Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of Abraham's Faith; wherein he plainly alludes to Gen. xv. 6. From all this, it is, I think, as plain as a thing can well be, that Circumcision was appointed by God to be the Sign or Token of that gracious Covenant which he was pleased to make with Abraham. And hence is Circumcision called the Covenant it self, as the Covenant made with Abraham is stiled the Covenant of Circumcision, *Acts* vii. 8. Nor is it any good Exception to this that the Replyers make, *That if Circumcision was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, it would be so still*: Since God may alter his own Institutions as he sees fit, as we see in fact he has done in this matter, by appointing *Baptism* for the same main Ends and Purposes which *Circumcision* serv'd for before, viz. to initiate People into Covenant with him, and distinguish them from the rest of the World. Hence are we said by the Apostle, *Col.* ii. 11, 12. to be circumcised into Christ by being baptized.

2. To my saying, That Children were always esteemed as having the same Privileges with their Parents; your Replyers except, *What, and must they be baptized for the Remission of Sins, before they have committed actual Sins?* But pray, have Infants no Guilt till they come to commit actual Sins? Does not the Apostle tell us, That by

* *one Man's Disobedience, many were* * *Rom.* v. 19.

made Sinners: That || *by Nature we* || *Eph.* ii. 3. 12.

are Children of Wrath, and Strangers

to the Covenant of Promise: Nay, that

† we bear the Image of the first Adam, † *1 Cor.* 22.

and that in Adam all die? And is it

not plainly intimated by all these Ex-

pressions, that by the Fall or Apostacy of our First

Parents, the Human Nature is corrupted, and their Po-

sterity plac'd in a state of Guilt and Condemnation.

Hence the Scriptures tell us, That by Christ it is, that

all shall be made alive, and become righteous; and

the way thus to be, our Lord himself

tells us, is † *to be born again of the Wa-* † *John* iii.

ter, 3, 6.

|| Gal. v. 17.

* Rom. viii. 7.

ter, and of the Spirit: Since, what is
|| *born of the Flesh, is only Flesh*; which
is, what does *lust against the Spirit*,
and is * *Enmity with God*. And now,
pray consider, whether it be indeed
no privilege to be by Baptism admitted into Covenant
with God; so that whereas before we were only the
Sons of Adam, we are now implanted into Christ, and
chosen to be the Sons of God? Is it no privilege to
be brought into a state of Favour and Acceptance with
God, to be freed from the curse of Death by being
entitled to a Blessed Resurrection; and to be so far
freed from the corruption of our Nature, as to have a
Covenant right to such Assistances as will enable us to
resist and restrain it, tho' we cannot entirely subdue it?
And yet these are undoubtedly the Effects of our ad-
mission to Christianity by Baptism.

3. The *Repliyers* except to *Mark x. 14*. That by
Kingdom of God, is not meant there the *Visible Church*,
but the *State of Glory*. But this they cannot be cer-
tain of; since upon search, I believe they'll find, that
this Phrase is oftner used in the New Testament for
the *Visible Church* here, than for the *State of Glory*
hereafter. But, supposing the *State of Glory* is meant
by it; let them shew me any place of Scripture which
declares, that they may be of the *Kingdom of Glory*
who are not first Members of the *Church* here.

4. To what I said of the Commission, *Matth. xxviii.*
19. they except, That Children are not capable of
being made Disciples. But, pray why? A Disciple
is a Scholar; and you cannot but know, that many are
so called who cannot actually learn; their being en-
tered into a School, being sufficient to give them
that Name. Besides, where do they find the name
Disciple limited to Believers? Does not the Holy
Scripture call all those who had received Circumci-
sion, *Disciples*? And many of them you cannot but
own, were *Infants*.

5. To *Rom. xi. 20.* their Exception is. *That Infants*
were not visible Church-Members before Christ's coming.

But

But, this is going farther than any of your Writers which I have yet seen, who, as far as I remember, do all grant, That *Infants were Members of the Jewish Church*: And I would fain know, to what End Circumcision did serve, if not to admit Persons into the *Jewish Church*, and thereby to separate them to God to be his People? And accordingly, God has expressly declared, That they who were not circumcised, had broken his Covenant, and accordingly were to be cut off, and not reckoned among his People or Members of his Church. By all which it appears, that by Circumcision the *Jews* were entred into the Church; and therefore, Infants being Circumcised, were reputed as Members of it: And if so, they are still to be esteemed so; since the only reason which the Apostle gives of any being cast out of the Church, who were before in it, is their being guilty of Unbelief: Which, since Infants cannot be guilty of, they still kept their standing, and were accordingly with their Parents receiv'd by Baptism into the Christian Church, which is only the *Jewish* one reform'd. And therefore, this same Apostle tells us, v. 16. That as in the *Jewish Church*, the Parents being Holy, separated to God, their Branches or Children were so too; so the same thing continues now under the Gospel Dispensation.

6. The Replyers are pleas'd to say, That they have a Command in express words for baptizing of Believers: And, why had they not produc'd this Command? The Texts they quote, as far as I can see, prove it only by consequence; and that way we can, and do prove, that *Infants* are to be baptized. Besides, Can either They or You produce a Command to baptize *only* Believers, which yet you must do to prove the Practice of Infant-Baptism sinful. For, sin is the transgression of some Law; and, where there is no Law, there can be no Transgression. I might ask farther; Where do You or They find any Command for baptizing grown Persons, whose Parents were Christians when they were born? or, where

where they do find any one Example of any such baptized? Or, Where do you find any Command for baptizing those at Years of Discretion, who have been baptized before? This I the rather ask, because for all these things, in order to be consistent with your own Principles, you ought to have a Command in express words, or else you are guilty of a sin. For thus your Writers lay it down as a general Rule, *That whatsoever is not commanded, is forbidden.* Now then, he may argue with you thus; The baptizing of the grown Children of Christian Parents, and who were baptized in their Infancy, is not commanded; therefore it is forbidden, and consequently sinful.

As to what the Replyers say, concerning admitting Women to the Sacrament, 'tis nothing to the purpose. For besides that, what they say, does not prove, that they may be admitted: The Question is not, Whether the lawfulness of admitting Women to the Sacrament, be to be proved by Scripture, since I never doubted of that; but, whether you have any better proof for your admitting *them* to that Ordinance, than we have for admitting *Infants* to Baptism. In short, whether Womens receiving the Lord's Supper be commanded in so many express words, which is what you seem to require of us for the proof of Infants Baptism. But indeed, I have observ'd, you can practice some things without such a Command, however you reject others for want of it. Thus you observe the first Day of the Week, and receive the Lord's Supper sitting, tho' 'tis nowhere said, ye shall do so. Nay, Mr. Keach uses the very same Argument for the observation of the Lord's Day, which he refuses when brought by us in Defence of Infants Baptism, viz. that its no where forbidden. *God has not,* says he, (*Gold Refin. p. 114.*) *enjoin'd the Jewish Sabbath under the Gospel;* and therefore, he concludes it lawful to observe the Lord's Day: So we say, God has not enjoin'd that only Believers should be baptized, and therefore we think it

lawful

awful to baptize Infants. But, what need I wonder at this, when your Writers baptize with Water, and yet do not pretend to produce one place where Water is expressly commanded; for, the only place, *John iii. 3, 5.* where it is expressly commanded, they deny to be meant of Christian Baptism. And now, is not this strange Partiality, thus to blame us for producing insufficient Proofs for our Practice, and yet you your selves to use in other matters the same or worse? It looks, I own, as if you were not governed by Conscience in this matter, but your own Fancy and Humour.

7. The Replyers blame me for calling Baptism a Seal; tho' the only reason they give of their so doing, is, that they no where read of Baptism being called so in Holy Scripture. But, tho' you have not the *Name* you have the *Thing*: Baptism is plainly enough described as a foederal Rite, or the way of Admission into the New Covenant. Hence we are said to be *† baptized †* *1 Cor. xiii. 12.* *into the Body or Church of Christ,* *13.* and by Baptism to *|| put on Christ. || Gal. iii. 27.* Now pray, what other use has a Seal in Covenanting? Is it not that by the use of it, Men strike Covenant one with another? If therefore this be the use of Baptism, as we see it is, may it not fitly be called by this Name?

But farther; You may observe, that the Apostle gives the name of *Seal* to Circumcision, *Rom. iv. 11.* which yet God only calls a *Sign* or *Token* of his Covenant. Now you your selves own Baptism to be a *Sign* of the Covenant; and, why then should you scruple calling it a Seal? The rather for that, I presume, these Replyers are Teachers among you, and who have therefore subscribed the 27th Article of Religion, where Baptism is expressly said, to *seal* the Promises of the New Covenant.

8. I observe, the Replyers cannot produce one Text of Scripture, where *actual* Faith and Repentance are requir'd *always* to go before Baptism; which, since they

they cannot do, I leave you to consider, Whether in making this *absolutely* necessary to Baptism, you do not add to the Word of God? which is what your Writers so often charge us with, and condemn us for. As to the places of Scripture your Writers here quote, they only prove, That *grown* Persons must make profession of their Faith and Repentance before they are admitted to Baptism: And this is what we affirm as well as you; and accordingly, we never do baptize any grown Persons without their making this Profession. But now I appeal to your selves, whether it be not reasonable to think, That if our Lord had design'd that *none* but grown Persons should be baptized, he would not somewhere or other have made some such Declaration as this, *Except any one believe and repent, he shall not be baptized*: Whereas on the contrary, he has said no such thing, nor so much as hinted this to be his Will. We read of none baptized, but such as were before their Baptism profess'd *Jews* or *Gentiles*: Tho' indeed, those of them which are said to have Families, we are told, were baptized They and Theirs; no Exception being made as to any little ones that might be in them. All which seems to me plainly to intimate, That Christ design'd his Church should be directed as to this particular of admitting Persons to be her Members, by what Instructions he had given to the Church which was in being before his coming: And this seems the more likely, because, as I said before, we cannot trace the beginning of this Custom to baptize Infants: And that therefore, 'tis probable, that 'twas begun by the Apostles, who observed *themselves*, the Custom of the Church they had been bred up in, and recommended the Observation of it to their Successors; by whom, it has been since continued through all Ages of the Church until this time, with little or no Opposition made to it till within these last 200 Years. For thus we are able to prove, that the baptizing of Infants was the Practice of those Churches which were original Plantations of the Apo-

les themselves, and who never own'd the Authority of the Pope of Rome; but by some of whom, as the Greek Church, the Pope is yearly Excommunicated. We have Testimonies of its being practised even while Miracles were yet in being in the Church, when God bore them witness with Signs and Wonders, and Gifts of the Holy Ghost; which surely he would never have done, had this Practice of Infant Baptism been, as some of your Writers term it, *Antichristian and Abominable*, and *† Vani. of Chil.* *Denial of Christ's being come in the Flesh.* Bap.pt. 2d. p. 30

Lastly, The Replyers say, That Infants are as capable of answering the Ends of the Lord's Supper as they are those of Baptism. But pray consider, whether Infants are as capable of thankfully remembering the Death of Christ, and the Benefits they receive thereby, which is the End of the Lord's Supper, as they are of being entered into the Church of Christ, and having the Blessings of the Covenant sealed to them, and being engaged on their part to perform the Conditions of it, which is the main End of Baptism. I dare say, if you impartially think of it, you'll not say they are as capable to do one as the other.

Having now, I think, done as to that part of the Reply which concerns the Subjects of Baptism; I am now, in the next place, to vindicate what I wrote concerning the manner of Administring this Sacrament.

First then, I had said, That we cannot find in the Scripture that our Lord has defined the manner of Baptizing to be Dipping or Plunging over Head and Ears, but only commanded Washing with Water. To this your Replyers say, That Baptism must be a total Washing, which does represent a Death, Burial, &c. But this, the Text they cite, does not prove; nor indeed is your Practice agreeable to this Assertion, since you do not wash the whole Body, the Body being covered with a Garment; and therefore, we read that in those places where they did baptize by Dipping,

ping, the Persons were stripp'd naked. Nor does your way of Baptizing represent a Burial, since in order to that, the Person ought not to go himself into the Water, but to be put in by others.

2. I said, to prove what I had asserted above, That the word *Baptize* does not signify only to Dip throughout the whole New Testament, but that when the Act of Dipping is mention'd, another word is used; for this last, I instanced in *Luke xvi. 24.* tho' by mistake it is printed *xiv.* where *Dives* requests of *Abraham*, that he would send *Lazarus* to dip the tip of his Finger, &c. The word for Dip in the Greek, is not *Baptisee* but *Bapsee*. But this the Re-
 plyers do not contradict: Nay, they seem to allow, that *Baptizo* does not always signify a total Washing, by their owning that when the Pharisees are said not to Wash except they are Baptized, their Hands, and not all their Body are meant. And by what is said, *2 Kings iii. 11.* we may learn, That even they were washed by having Water poured on them. Thus our Saviour's Sufferings are called a *Baptism*, *Mark x. 39.* tho' we know, he was only wet and sprinkled with the Blood and Water which came out of his Side. Thus the Apostles are said to be baptized with the Holy Ghost; when yet the Holy Ghost is said to be poured out on them. But to this the Re-
 plyers except, by observing that the Holy Ghost filled the House where the Apostles were, and so they were cover'd all over with it. But this is a mistake of the Text, which does not say, that the Holy Ghost filled the House, but that the Sound or Noise of the rushing mighty Wind filled the House.

Next, The Re-
 plyers except to my Saying, That you do ill to blame our Translators for not translating the word *Baptizo* to Dip; that we our selves confess, that Dipping is Baptizing. And what then? So is sprinkling or pouring on Water baptizing, but dipping is not sprinkling or pouring on Water; so that, if our Translators had rendred baptize to dip, they

they too m
 conce
 how
 since
 tism a
 yet, y
 says
 does
 ped al
 But
 tize si
 then
 said so
 do. T
 signifie
 it signi
 Mr. Le
 kind of
 indeed
 whatev
 Next
 confess
 But, w
 it enjo
 places,
 or Dippi
 way.
 that Sp
 Rome:
 think
 Apostle
 ing: T
 comes
 y any
 in the
 izing b
 his tim
 mons an
 ion of

they would have restrain'd the sense of the word too much : They are *You* therefore, who are most concern'd in the Advice that follows, of taking heed how you bring in Errors into the Worship of God, since you assert, that Dipping is so essential to Baptism as that without it Baptism is no Baptism : And yet, you cannot produce one place of Scripture that says so ; you cannot prove, that the word *Baptize* does signify *only* to Dip ; nor that the Apostles dipped *all*, nay, nor *any* that they baptized.

But farther ; The Replyers say, if the word *Baptize* signifies any kind of Washing, as I say it does, then *Stephanus*, *Scapula*, *Hammond*, &c. would have said something thereof ; and so I can assure you, they do. Thus *Stephanus* and *Scapula* say, That *Baptize* signifies the *Act of Washing* ; and Dr. *Hammond*, That it signifies the *washing of any Part of the Body* : So Mr. *Leigh*, That the word *Baptize* is taken for *any kind of Washing*. But this the Replyers leave out, as indeed 'tis the usual way of your Writers, to conceal whatever makes against them.

Next, the Replyers say, That the Church of *Rome* confesses, that she changed Dipping into Sprinkling. But, where does she so confess ? I am sure, I find it enjoin'd in her Ritual at this Day, *That in those places, where it is the custom to baptize by Immersion or Dipping, there Baptism ought to be administred that way*. So that indeed we have no reason to think, that Sprinkling was introduced by the Church of *Rome* : On the contrary, we have good grounds to think it practised from the beginning. Thus the Apostle calls Baptism, *Eph. v. 26. Tit. iii. 5. Washing* : The word in the Original is *Loutron*, which comes from a Verb, which all allow, signifies properly any kind of Washing. *Justin Martyr*, who lived in the Year 150, intimates, That the way of Baptizing by Sprinkling, was in use in his time, since he says, That the *Demons* among the *Heathens*, in imitation of the Baptismal Washing, in-

*Vid. Walker's
Doct. of Bap-
tisms.*

roduced the Custom of sprinkling Water to be used by their Worshippers. So *Tertullian* speaking to a wicked Person, Who, says he, will afford you, who are one whose Repentance is so little to be trusted, one sprinkling of Water? So we read of *Novatus*, who about the Year 250, was, we are told, sprinkled, when he was baptized on the very same Bed on which he lay dangerously sick, and like to die, as *Eusebius* reports it. And this, *St. Cyprian* justifies as a valid and good Baptism; and therefore, tho' we find, that Persons so baptized were not permitted to enter into Holy Orders, because, as the Canon expresses it, *they were baptized not voluntarily but of necessity*; Yet, we no where read of any so baptized that were afterwards baptized again. And now, I hope, after all these Proofs from Scripture and Antiquity for the lawfulness of this way of baptizing, you will however, be a little more sparing of your Censures of us for it.

As to what your Replyers here add, That Infants Baptism was brought into the Church of Rome, I have answer'd it before. And now let me entreat you on the whole to consider, Whether or no we do indeed deserve that Treatment, which even the most substantial of your Writers give us, That our Church should be called the WHORE, as Mr. *Van. Child*. Barber styles Her; that our Ministry should be stiled False and Antichristian; and, that it should be said, That that Tribe, as the same Person styles them, are led to support Infant-Baptism by that convincing Argument, their Revenues; that the reason why they do not examine things, is, because Times and Preferment stand thwart, as Mr. *Blackwood* charitably insinuates; that Infant-Baptism is only a meer Device and Tradition of Men, brought into the World for Politick and By-ends, and still defended meerly by the subtlety of human Arts, and acuteness of Man's Brain, as

|| A. R.
and th
in th
the Pr
themse
sel of
that th
dren o
Churc
true
Keach
such
cannot
ters Bo
of the
of Chr
ing of
pressio
God J
God h
they a
say, t
though
so poss
so man
of whi
is asser
1. *
being a
God's
2. *
removi
dred u
whereb
3. *
wise th
4. +
absolute
ditions.

|| A. R. asserts; * that 'tis an Idol, and that they who defend it, follow in the steps of their Predecessors, the Priests and Elders, who justified themselves in their rejecting the Counsel of God, as are the words of the same Person; that they who have been sprinkled, whether as Children or Adult, are unbaptized People, and that the Churches composed of such, are no true Churches of Christ, as || Mr. Keach is pleased to assert. These and such like Expressions, which you cannot but take notice of as common in your Writers Books, you cannot surely but think an Argument of their being acted by some other Spirit than that of Christ. And indeed it seems to me, that their being of so conceited and proud a Temper as the Expressions they use shew them to be, is the reason why God has suffered them to fall into so many Errors. God has told us, That the *Meek* he will teach; that they are the *Lowly* who learn of him. And I dare say, that if your Teachers had but more modest thoughts of themselves, they would neither write in so positive a Strain as they generally do, nor fall into so many Mistakes as some of them have done: Some of which I shall just mention, and so conclude. It is asserted then;

1. * That God's decreeing of Sin being a way to manifest the Glory of God's Justice, is a good thing. * *Blackwood Catech. p. 7,*
2. * That God works about sin, by removing the Impediments that hindered us from sinning, and setting before us Objects whereby he knows our Corruptions will be entic'd. 10.
3. * That God's tending means to all, is no other-wise than the shining of the Sun upon the Blind.
4. † That the Gospel Covenant is absolutely without Works or any Conditions. † *Keach's Reel. Reel. p. 55.*

5. || That

|| *Confes. An. 44.*

Art. 36, 42.

* *Id. Art. 45.*

† *Black. Cate.*

p. 53.

|| *Van. Child.*

Bap. part. 2d.

p. 12.

* *Ib. p. 27,*

28.

|| That all Church Power in in the hand of the People.

6. * That all gifted Members may preach and baptize, yea, tho' they are not † baptized themselves.

7. || That Infants of Believers are out of the Covenant of Grace, as much as the Children of *Turks* or *Pagans*.

8. * That no Magistrate ought to be owned Head of the Church, nor to have any Power in it.

9. Many of you in *Kent* and *Sussex*, count singing of *Psalms* unlawful, tho' warranted by a Gospel Precept, and the Examples of Christ and his Apostles themselves, as *Matth. xxvi. 20, 30.* *Acts xvi. 25.* *Col. 3. 16.* *James v. 13.*

10. Many (nay, we heard the most) of you, (if we may believe the Author of the *Vail turn'd aside*, one of your own Persuasion, as to denying Infants Baptism,) deny the Doctrine of the Trinity and Christ's Satisfaction, disbelieve God's Omnipresence, and affirm, That God is in the Shape of a Man, or some such kind of Form. Among whom are said to be the Teachers of the Congregations of *Anabaptists* at *Dover*, *Folkstone*, and *Hythe*, and other Parts of *East-Kent*; many in the *Weald* of *Kent* and *Sussex*, who have not refused to hold Communion with *Cassen* and *Allen*, and the rest who hold those Heresies, as some at *Ashford* and *London* I hear have done.

Lastly, Many of you, especially those who live in *Kent* and *Sussex*, are said to hold, the sleeping of the Soul with the Body in the Grave.

I could mention other false and erroneous Tenets taught by your Teachers, but I am loth to trouble you now any farther; only I beg you to consider what I have here said, and I hope the Lord will give you understanding in all things. I am

Feb. 28.

1702

Your Affectionate Friend and Servant
in Christ Jesus.



B C

D R.

again

Dr. Re

the l

Dr. Hi

Dr. A

Mr. Ol

Mr. Wil

the

Mr. Her

Mr. Wal

A religi

rithuc

Keac

Mr. Bur

Mr. Ross

Mr. Dor

baptiz

's l

Anaba

Dr. Wal

Mr. Turn

A seriou

A short

late B

Edwar

BOOKS written in Defence of Infants-Baptism.

DR. *Hammond's* Letter concerning Infant-Baptism;
printed at *Lond.* 1653.

—— Baptizing of Infants reviewed and defended
against the Exception of Mr. *Tombs*, 1655.

Dr. Reading's Antidote against *Anabaptism*, in answer to
the liberty of Prophecy, 1654.

Dr. Hicks's Case of Infant-Baptism.

Dr. Asheton's Conference with an *Anabaptist*.

Mr. Ollyffe's Defence of Infant-Baptism.

Mr. William Allen's Persuasive to Peace, &c. 1680.

—— Address to the *Nonconformists*, beginning with
the *Anabaptists*, 1693.

Mr. Hewerdine's Letters, in defence of Infant-Baptism:

Mr. Walker's Modest Plea for Infant-Baptism, *Camb.* 1677:

—— Treatise of Dipping, &c. *Lond.* 1678.

A religious Conference betwixt a Minister and his Pa-
rishioners, in Three Parts; being an Answer to *Ben.*
Keach's Gold Refin'd, and Rector Rectified.

Mr. Burkit's Discourse of Infant-Baptism, 1695.

Mr. Rossington's Infant-Baptism asserted, 1700.

Mr. Dorrington's Vindication of the Christian Church in
baptizing Infants, 1701.

——'s Plain Man's Preservative from the Error of the
Anabaptists, 1702.

Dr. Wallis's Defence of Infant-Baptism.

Mr. Turner's Vindication of Infants Baptism.

A serious Address to the *Anabaptists*, 1701.

A short Defence of Infants-Baptism, in answer to a
late Book, Entituled, *The Rector Corrected*, &c. By
Edward Pay, 1702.

1000

1000

1000

